## III.   REMARKS

Applicant has considered the current Office Action of mailing date November 2, 2007. Claims 1-15 are pending in this application. Claims 1, 7, 14 and 15 have been amended. Applicant is not conceding in this Amendment that those claims are not patentable over the art cited by the Office. The present claim amendments are only for facilitating expeditious prosecution of the application.

Entry of this Amendment is proper under 37 C.F.R. §1.116(b) because the Amendment: (a) places the application in condition for allowance as discussed below; (b) does not raise any new issues requiring further search and/or consideration; and (c) places the application in better form for appeal. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request entry of this Amendment.

In the Office Action, claims 1 – 15 are rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as obvious over Hennum et al. (US Patent No.: 6,259,445), hereafter "Hennum" in view of Cooper (US Patent No.: 6,871,348), hereinafter "Cooper".

Applicant does not acquiesce in the correctness of the rejections and reserves the right to present specific arguments regarding any rejected claims not specifically addressed. Further, Applicant respectfully reserves the right to pursue the full scope of the subject matter of these original claims and other claims in one or more subsequent patent application that claim(s) priority to the instant application. Reconsideration in view of the following remarks is respectfully requested.


**Rejection of Claims 1 – 15 Under 35 USC §103(a)**

With respect to the Office's rejection of the claims under 35 USC §103(a), Applicant respectfully submits that Hennum in combination with Cooper do not teach or suggest each and every feature of the claimed invention.

According to the Office, Cooper cures Hennum's deficiency for "not explicitly teach[ing] wherein each of the windows [being] integrated as ***separate segments within a single window*** and wherein the generated tutorial application is self-contained." Page 3 of the current Office Action. The Office alleges that Cooper teaches or suggests that "[e]ach ***window of one or more applications*** is attached to a 'shell application' … thereby meeting the claim limitation". Page 4 of current Office Action. However, Cooper's at col. 2, lines 55 – 67 discloses a shell application that "…provide[s] an integrated environment …[where] ***several different applications*** [are presented] as ***dialogs or just different work modes***". To this extent, the several different applications in Cooper are ***not*** displayed "…***within a single window***". Claim 1. As such, Cooper does not teach or suggest the claimed invention.

Furthermore, Cooper does not teach or suggest, *inter alia*, the claimed display interface displaying "***separate segments*** of [a] ***single tutorial application*** *within a single window*". Claim 1. On the contrary, Cooper's integrated environment provides for "***launch[ing] application[s] to become a part of the shell***". Col. 2, lines 62 – 63. To this extent, there is no nexus between Cooper's integrated environment and the claimed display interface because launching one or more applications in an integrated environment so as to form part of a shell application has no comparative relevance to displaying parts of a single applications within a single window. As such, Cooper does not tech or suggest the claimed invention.

Even assuming *arguendo* that the Office's alleged rationale is correct, one of ordinary skill in the art would not find any motivation to combine Hennum with Cooper because Cooper's integrated environment provided by the shell application does not "simultaneously display: [the] list…; [the] code window…; and the explanation window… of the generated ***single tutorial application***". Claim 1. Instead with the combined teachings of Hennum and Cooper, a person of ordinary skill in the art would achieve a "[p]resentation … displaying ***multiple windows*** on a screen", Hennum at , col. 3, line 12 – 16, where "***several different applications*** [are presented]

as *dialogs or just different work modes*" (i.e., the multiple windows displaying different dialogs or work modes of several applications). As such, a person of ordinary skill will never achieve the claimed invention of displaying "the tutorial steps, the code window and the explanation window *within a single window*", claim 1, (i.e. the claimed display interface displays various *elements/parts of* a *single* application *separately* in a *single window*). Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the Office withdraw the rejection under §103(a).

Applicant reiterates the foregoing arguments in support of similar amendments in independent claim 7 and dependent claims 14 – 15. Consequently, all other claims dependent from independent claims 1 and 7 are allowable for the reasons stated above as well as for their unique features. These features and the appropriateness of the Office's combinations and modifications have not been separately addressed herein for brevity. However, Applicant reserves the right to present such arguments in a later response should one be necessary. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully request withdrawal of the rejections under 35 USC §103(a).


**IV. Conclusion**

Applicant respectfully submits that the application is in condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes that anything further is necessary to place the application in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to contact Applicant's undersigned representative at the telephone number listed below.

<div align="right">

Respectfully submitted,

 /John A. Merecki/
John A. Merecki
Reg. No. 35,812
JAM/TC

</div>

Dated:   December 21, 2007

Hoffman, Warnick & D'Alessandro LLC
75 State Street, 14th Floor
Albany, NY 12207
(518) 449-0044 - Telephone
(518) 449-0047 - Facsimile